

### **REMARKS**

This submission is in response to the Official Action dated January 19, 2006. Claims 1-20 were pending in the application. Claims 9-18 were withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention after restriction, and have now been cancelled herein. Claim 1-8 and 19-20 stand rejected. Claim 21 has been added herein to more fully claim the invention. Therefore, claims 1-8 and 19-21 are currently pending.

The specification has been amended to conform to U.S. requirements.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the personal interview with Applicants and Applicants' representative on June 21, 2006. The following constitutes Applicants' written statement in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b) and MPEP § 713.04. Applicants, Applicants' representative and the Examiner discussed the claimed invention, the pending rejections, and the art cited by the Examiner. However, no agreement was reached.

Applicants also wish to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview with Applicants' representative on July 19, 2006. The following constitutes Applicants' written statement in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b) and MPEP § 713.04. Applicants' representative and the Examiner discussed the claimed invention, the pending rejections, and the art cited by the Examiner. The parties reached agreement as to claim language that is acceptable to the Examiner.

Before turning to the merits of the Official Action, Applicants wish to point out on the record that Applicants' Request to Correct Inventorship Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(a) filed February 11, 2005 was indicated as approved in the Official Action mailed March 25, 2005 (see page 5).

As for the merits of the pending Official Action, claims 1, 3-8, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art

(AAPA) in view of Baxter *et al.* (US20030218663). Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Baxter and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,895,074 to Chess *et al.* According to the examiner, the AAPA discloses obtaining a printed microperforated sheet with a plurality of images with overprinted decorations. Baxter teaches applying a varnish topcoat in a printing process. The Examiner contends that it would be obvious to provide the printed/overprinted images of the AAPA with a protective varnish layer to protect the printed image from mechanical damage.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Applicants' specification does not disclose that the prior art contained microperforated sheets with a plurality of images with overprinted decorations. Rather, the specification expressly states that "perforated sheets bearing a plurality of holy cards coated with a decorative layer do not exist on the market today." Page 2, lines 4-5; *see also* page 1, line 28 - page 2, line 3. What existed prior to Applicants' invention was sheets without decorations and individual cards with decorations. *See generally* page 1 and 2. It is part of Applicants' own invention to create sheets of images with decorations, which is more efficient than producing individual cards. Thus, the prior art fails to teach or suggest this limitation of the claims, and the claims cannot be unpatentable thereover.

To this end, the Examiner should note that the pending claims are directed to sheets containing a plurality of images. Applicants have amended claim 1 to further clarify this, although Applicants believe that the claims were sufficiently clear on this issue and patentable without the amendments. As such, the amendments were not made for reasons related to patentability, nor narrow the scope of the claims.

In addition, one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation or suggestion to utilize the varnish system of Baxter in the present invention. Applicants found that when the sheets containing overprinted decorations they created were inserted into a laser printer or photocopier (again, more efficient than printing individual cards as in the prior art), the heat of

Applicant(s): Andrea BONELLA *et al.*  
Serial No.: 10/820,970  
Confirmation No.: 9550  
Group Art Unit: 2854  
Filed: April 7, 2004  
Examiner: R. L. Yan

PAGE 7

Docket No.: 02564/0202010-US0

the machines would detach fragments of the decorative layer and foul the printer/photocopier. Thus, the problem facing the Applicants was quite different from Baxter, and Baxter does not teach or suggest a solution to the Applicants' specific problem of preventing damage to a subsequent printing machine. Indeed, Baxter does not teach or suggest further printing at all. Therefore, the claims are not unpatentable for these reasons also.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Dated: July 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By           /Kevin L. Reiner/            
Kevin L. Reiner  
Registration No.: 43,040  
DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
P.O. Box 5257  
New York, New York 10150-5257  
(212) 527-7700  
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)  
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant